

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution
FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
Aberdeen	Sac & Fox	813	54%	\$170,321	\$16,000	\$20	54%
Aberdeen	Winnebago	4,189	55%	\$626,318	\$58,000	\$14	55%
Aberdeen	Omaha	3,773	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	61%
Aberdeen	Santee	1,372	37%	\$981,778	\$91,000	\$66	39%
Aberdeen	Northern Ponca	1,667	44%	\$864,622	\$80,000	\$48	46%
Aberdeen	Turtle Mountain	13,760	67%	\$0	\$0	\$0	67%
Aberdeen	Standing Rock	9,864	46%	\$3,765,248	\$348,000	\$35	47%
Aberdeen	Spirit Lake (Ft. Totten)	5,201	44%	\$2,341,131	\$216,000	\$42	46%
Aberdeen	Three Affiliated (Ft. Berthold)	5,944	44%	\$2,568,959	\$237,000	\$40	46%
Aberdeen	Trenton	1,563	45%	\$723,387	\$67,000	\$43	47%
Aberdeen	Rapid City	12,324	42%	\$5,587,286	\$516,000	\$42	44%
Aberdeen	Cheyenne River	8,427	44%	\$3,762,496	\$347,000	\$41	45%
Aberdeen	Pine Ridge	23,613	59%	\$864,321	\$80,000	\$3	59%
Aberdeen	Rosebud	13,731	53%	\$2,553,571	\$236,000	\$17	54%
Aberdeen	Sisseton-Wahpeton	6,088	44%	\$2,774,736	\$256,000	\$42	45%
Aberdeen	Yankton	4,278	59%	\$159,781	\$15,000	\$4	59%
Aberdeen	Flandreau	1,767	38%	\$1,179,929	\$109,000	\$62	40%
Aberdeen	Crow Creek	3,853	53%	\$832,563	\$77,000	\$20	53%
Aberdeen	Lower Brule	2,113	53%	\$465,001	\$43,000	\$20	53%
Aberdeen Total		124,338	52%	\$30,221,451	\$2,792,000	\$22	53%
Alaska	Aleutian Pribilof Islands Associatic	1,019	83%	\$0	\$0	\$0	83%
Alaska	Arctic Slope Regional Tribe	5,028	57%	\$598,371	\$55,000	\$11	57%
Alaska	Bristol Bay Area Health	7,152	67%	\$0	\$0	\$0	67%
Alaska	Chugachmiut Tribe	1,849	68%	\$0	\$0	\$0	68%
Alaska	Copper River Native Associaton	497	96%	\$0	\$0	\$0	96%
Alaska	Eastern Aleutian Tribe	968	51%	\$406,678	\$38,000	\$39	52%
Alaska	Kenaitze Indian Tribe	1,309	56%	\$175,860	\$16,000	\$12	57%
Alaska	Ketchikan Indian Corporation	3,184	37%	\$3,104,875	\$287,000	\$90	39%
Alaska	Kodiak	2,777	48%	\$1,435,899	\$133,000	\$48	49%
Alaska	Maniilaq	7,200	97%	\$0	\$0	\$0	97%
Alaska	Metlakatla Indian Tribe	1,490	37%	\$1,555,804	\$144,000	\$97	39%
Alaska	Misc. Anchorage Tribes	341	151%	\$0	\$0	\$0	151%
Alaska	Ninilchik	224	76%	\$0	\$0	\$0	76%
Alaska	Norton Sound	7,411	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	63%
Alaska	Seldovia	744	33%	\$889,227	\$82,000	\$110	35%

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution

FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
Alaska	Southcentral Foundation	28,644	74%	\$0	\$0	\$0	74%
Alaska	Southeast Alaska Regional Health	11,334	67%	\$0	\$0	\$0	67%
Alaska	Tanana Chiefs Conference	13,032	45%	\$7,160,588	\$661,000	\$51	47%
Alaska	Yukon Kuskokwim	19,790	49.5%	\$7,452,562	\$688,000	\$35	50%
Alaska Total		113,993	62%	\$22,779,864	\$2,104,000	\$18	63%
Albuquerque	Albuquerque	31,003	40%	\$13,474,721	\$1,244,000	\$40	42%
Albuquerque	Acoma-Canoncito-Laguna	11,689	50%	\$2,713,176	\$250,000	\$21	51%
Albuquerque	Mescalero	4,247	53%	\$736,921	\$68,000	\$16	54%
Albuquerque	Santa Fe	18,362	54%	\$2,358,936	\$218,000	\$12	55%
Albuquerque	Zuni	9,125	53%	\$1,711,738	\$158,000	\$17	53%
Albuquerque	Ramah	2,100	46%	\$904,132	\$83,000	\$40	47%
Albuquerque	So Colorado Ute	5,256	55%	\$738,467	\$68,000	\$13	55%
Albuquerque	Ysleta Del Sur	861	86%	\$0	\$0	\$0	86%
Albuquerque	Jicarilla	3,739	41%	\$1,891,964	\$175,000	\$47	43%
Albuquerque Total		86,382	48%	\$24,530,055	\$2,264,000	\$26	49%
Bemidji	Bad River	1,928	39%	\$1,091,366	\$101,000	\$52	41%
Bemidji	Bay Mills	1,172	34%	\$909,891	\$84,000	\$72	36%
Bemidji	Fond Du Lac	5,475	34%	\$3,695,047	\$341,000	\$62	36%
Bemidji	Forest County	830	37%	\$568,214	\$52,000	\$63	39%
Bemidji	Grand Portage	472	40%	\$261,450	\$24,000	\$51	42%
Bemidji	Grand Traverse	1,506	50%	\$382,902	\$35,000	\$23	51%
Bemidji	Greater Leech Lake	9,217	37%	\$5,163,606	\$477,000	\$52	39%
Bemidji	Greater Red Lake	7,232	60%	\$71,475	\$10,000	\$1	60%
Bemidji	Greater White Earth	7,743	48%	\$2,240,828	\$207,000	\$27	49%
Bemidji	Ho-Chunk	3,530	39%	\$1,998,997	\$185,000	\$52	41%
Bemidji	Huron Potawatomi	646	34%	\$466,863	\$43,000	\$67	37%
Bemidji	Keweenaw Bay	1,673	36%	\$1,149,952	\$106,000	\$63	38%
Bemidji	Lac Courte Oreilles	3,682	34%	\$2,445,979	\$226,000	\$61	37%
Bemidji	Lac Du Flambeau	2,655	41%	\$1,364,749	\$126,000	\$47	43%
Bemidji	Lac Vieux Desert	395	76%	\$0	\$0	\$0	76%
Bemidji	Little River Ottawa	1,003	36%	\$677,353	\$63,000	\$63	38%
Bemidji	Little Traverse Odawa	2,640	37%	\$1,482,076	\$137,000	\$52	39%
Bemidji	Lower Sioux	523	32%	\$420,505	\$39,000	\$75	35%
Bemidji	Gun Lake	291	35%	\$213,388	\$20,000	\$69	37%
Bemidji	Menominee	7,148	29%	\$5,486,246	\$506,000	\$71	32%

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution
FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
Bemidji	Hannahville	797	35%	\$577,817	\$53,000	\$66	38%
Bemidji	Mille Lacs	2,125	31%	\$1,765,904	\$163,000	\$77	34%
Bemidji	Bois Forte/Nett Lake	1,177	52%	\$238,211	\$22,000	\$19	53%
Bemidji	Oneida	7,519	33%	\$4,945,762	\$456,000	\$61	35%
Bemidji	Pokagon Potawatomi	2,525	31%	\$2,176,526	\$201,000	\$80	34%
Bemidji	Prairie Island	344	45%	\$152,335	\$14,000	\$41	47%
Bemidji	Shakopee	452	33%	\$380,161	\$35,000	\$77	36%
Bemidji	Red Cliff	1,560	38%	\$1,007,557	\$93,000	\$60	40%
Bemidji	Saginaw Chippewa	2,150	29%	\$1,910,978	\$176,000	\$82	32%
Bemidji	Saulte Sainte Marie	9,210	34%	\$5,619,942	\$519,000	\$56	37%
Bemidji	Sokaogon	549	37%	\$337,703	\$31,000	\$56	40%
Bemidji	St Croix	1,537	27%	\$1,516,583	\$140,000	\$91	30%
Bemidji	Stockbridge-Munsee	1,365	55%	\$194,754	\$18,000	\$13	56%
Bemidji	Upper Sioux	362	41%	\$198,011	\$18,000	\$50	43%
Bemidji Total		91,434	39%	\$51,113,131	\$4,721,000	\$52	41%
Billings	Blackfeet	12,391	62%	\$0	\$0	\$0	62%
Billings	Crow	12,781	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	72%
Billings	Ft Belknap	5,733	74%	\$0	\$0	\$0	74%
Billings	Ft Peck	9,668	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	61%
Billings	No. Cheyenne	7,599	68%	\$0	\$0	\$0	68%
Billings	Wind River	10,677	50%	\$2,444,354	\$226,000	\$21	51%
Billings	Flathead	10,699	47%	\$3,680,793	\$340,000	\$32	48%
Billings	Rocky Boy	5,143	52%	\$1,133,634	\$105,000	\$20	52%
Billings Total		74,690	60%	\$7,258,781	\$671,000	\$9	61%
California	Berry Creek/Mooretown/Feather F	3,054	37%	\$1,820,480	\$168,000	\$55	39%
California	Cabazon	11	244%	\$0	\$0	\$0	244%
California	Central Valley	5,087	35%	\$3,158,385	\$292,000	\$57	37%
California	Chapa De	3,602	38%	\$2,076,174	\$192,000	\$53	40%
California	Colusa	236	20%	\$299,762	\$74,000	\$314	30%
California	Consolidated	2,402	35%	\$1,576,494	\$146,000	\$61	38%
California	Greenville	1,218	31%	\$977,050	\$90,000	\$74	34%
California	Hoopla	2,803	55%	\$374,715	\$35,000	\$12	55%
California	Indian Health Council	4,400	52%	\$883,429	\$82,000	\$19	53%
California	Karuk	1,758	52%	\$393,155	\$36,000	\$20	52%
California	Lake County	1,251	37%	\$838,452	\$77,000	\$62	39%

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution
FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
California	Lassen	899	46%	\$373,233	\$34,000	\$38	47%
California	Modoc	184	105%	\$0	\$0	\$0	105%
California	Northern Valley	1,552	38%	\$934,517	\$86,000	\$55	40%
California	Pit River	917	60%	\$3,170	\$0	\$0	60%
California	Quartz Valley	106	49%	\$31,166	\$10,000	\$94	53%
California	Redding Rancheria	3,812	53%	\$633,545	\$58,000	\$15	54%
California	Riverside/San Bernardino	9,398	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	63%
California	Round Valley	1,194	41%	\$648,749	\$60,000	\$50	43%
California	Santa Ynez	522	44%	\$251,916	\$23,000	\$44	46%
California	Shingle Springs	671	45%	\$296,376	\$27,000	\$40	47%
California	Sonoma County	3,923	40%	\$2,065,631	\$191,000	\$49	42%
California	Southern Indian Health Council	1,833	88%	\$0	\$0	\$0	88%
California	Sycuan	96	86%	\$0	\$0	\$0	86%
California	Table Mountain	26	94%	\$0	\$0	\$0	94%
California	Toiyabe	2,672	58%	\$164,303	\$15,000	\$6	58%
California	Tule River	2,414	57%	\$162,753	\$15,000	\$6	58%
California	Tuolumne	1,648	52%	\$348,123	\$32,000	\$19	53%
California	United Indian Health Services	6,186	41%	\$2,903,000	\$268,000	\$43	43%
California	Warner Mountain	114	109%	\$0	\$0	\$0	109%
California Total		63,989	49%	\$21,214,578	\$2,011,000	\$31	50%
Nashville	Alabama Coushatta	864	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	61%
Nashville	Catawba	1,185	71%	\$0	\$0	\$0	71%
Nashville	Cherokee	11,615	56%	\$981,005	\$91,000	\$8	56%
Nashville	Chitimacha	422	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	66%
Nashville	Choctaw	8,210	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	61%
Nashville	Coushatta	427	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0	80%
Nashville	Houlton Band Of Maliseet	389	100%	\$0	\$0	\$0	100%
Nashville	Jena Band Of Choctaw	128	83%	\$0	\$0	\$0	83%
Nashville	Miccosukee	709	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	66%
Nashville	Micmac	535	113%	\$0	\$0	\$0	113%
Nashville	Mohegan	1,024	38%	\$752,674	\$69,000	\$67	40%
Nashville	Narragansett	723	80%	\$0	\$0	\$0	80%
Nashville	Oneida	2,079	48%	\$708,122	\$65,000	\$31	49%
Nashville	Pass.. Township	923	75%	\$0	\$0	\$0	75%
Nashville	Pass.-Pleasant Point	1,190	74%	\$0	\$0	\$0	74%

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution
FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
Nashville	Penobscot	1,406	73%	\$0	\$0	\$0	73%
Nashville	Pequot	982	37%	\$769,058	\$71,000	\$72	39%
Nashville	Poarch Creek	2,371	51%	\$477,426	\$44,000	\$19	52%
Nashville	St. Regis Mohawk	5,061	39%	\$2,591,157	\$239,000	\$47	40%
Nashville	Seminole	3,347	53%	\$555,365	\$51,000	\$15	54%
Nashville	Seneca	4,973	56%	\$540,410	\$50,000	\$10	56%
Nashville	Tunica-Biloxi	251	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	72%
Nashville	Wampanoag Of Gayhead	303	55%	\$46,708	\$10,000	\$33	56%
Nashville Total		49,114	57%	\$7,421,924	\$690,000	\$14	58%
Navajo	Chinle	28,625	40%	\$12,157,880	\$1,122,000	\$39	42%
Navajo	Tsaile	9,359	33%	\$6,179,970	\$570,000	\$61	35%
Navajo	Crownpoint	22,337	39%	\$9,998,850	\$923,000	\$41	41%
Navajo	Fort Defiance	31,072	45%	\$10,540,494	\$973,000	\$31	46%
Navajo	Gallup	35,166	59%	\$437,254	\$40,000	\$1	59%
Navajo	Tohatchi	9,362	56%	\$818,750	\$76,000	\$8	57%
Navajo	Kayenta	15,526	35%	\$8,448,029	\$780,000	\$50	37%
Navajo	Inscription House	4,975	31%	\$3,737,466	\$345,000	\$69	33%
Navajo	Shiprock	46,322	56%	\$3,488,013	\$322,000	\$7	57%
Navajo	Dzilh Na O Dith Hle	5,993	43%	\$2,478,482	\$229,000	\$38	44%
Navajo	Tuba City	29,087	48%	\$7,173,212	\$662,000	\$23	49%
Navajo	Winslow	15,998	39%	\$7,443,601	\$687,000	\$43	41%
Navajo Total		253,821	47%	\$72,902,001	\$6,729,000	\$27	48%
Oklahoma	Claremore	32,085	45%	\$9,506,030	\$877,000	\$27	46%
Oklahoma	Clinton	11,682	43%	\$4,120,995	\$380,000	\$33	45%
Oklahoma	Haskell	4,006	39%	\$2,036,067	\$188,000	\$47	41%
Oklahoma	Holton	1,819	46%	\$713,843	\$66,000	\$36	47%
Oklahoma	Lawton	23,933	46%	\$6,358,242	\$587,000	\$25	48%
Oklahoma	Pawnee	10,636	50%	\$2,236,752	\$206,000	\$19	51%
Oklahoma	Tahlequah	16,935	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	63%
Oklahoma	Wewoka	11,241	33%	\$6,683,134	\$617,000	\$55	35%
Oklahoma	Abs Shawnee	5,242	34%	\$3,429,791	\$317,000	\$60	36%
Oklahoma	Chickasaw	30,421	49%	\$6,522,464	\$602,000	\$20	50%
Oklahoma	Cherokee	68,283	31%	\$39,496,843	\$3,645,000	\$53	33%
Oklahoma	Choctaw	32,975	50%	\$6,457,083	\$596,000	\$18	51%
Oklahoma	Creek	24,829	31%	\$14,128,754	\$1,304,000	\$53	34%

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution
FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
Oklahoma	Kaw	1,170	37%	\$724,137	\$67,000	\$57	39%
Oklahoma	Kickapoo Of Kansas	599	51%	\$140,287	\$13,000	\$22	52%
Oklahoma	Kickapoo Of Texas	538	71%	\$0	\$0	\$0	71%
Oklahoma	Ponca Tribe Of Oklahoma	4,260	38%	\$2,315,906	\$214,000	\$50	40%
Oklahoma	Kickapoo Of Oklahoma	5,939	29%	\$4,411,846	\$407,000	\$69	32%
Oklahoma	Citizen Potawatomi	12,020	29%	\$7,899,478	\$729,000	\$61	32%
Oklahoma	Iowa Of Oklahoma	1,248	22%	\$1,272,917	\$259,000	\$208	30%
Oklahoma	Sac And Fox Of Oklahoma	8,651	26%	\$6,597,087	\$776,000	\$90	30%
Oklahoma	Wyandotte / E Shawnee	952	43%	\$435,373	\$40,000	\$42	44%
Oklahoma	Miami Consortium	8,398	32%	\$5,279,123	\$487,000	\$58	35%
Oklahoma Total		317,864	40%	\$130,766,153	\$12,377,000	\$39	42%
Phoenix	PIMC	49,783	49%	\$12,384,449	\$1,143,000	\$23	50%
Phoenix	Keams Canyon/Hopi	6,882	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	66%
Phoenix	U&O	4,088	52%	\$824,439	\$76,000	\$19	53%
Phoenix	Whiteriver	15,016	47%	\$4,650,077	\$429,000	\$29	48%
Phoenix	Ft. Yuma	3,787	60%	\$34,174	\$10,000	\$3	60%
Phoenix	Colorado River	5,247	60%	\$0	\$0	\$0	60%
Phoenix	Peach Springs/Supai	2,449	56%	\$302,329	\$28,000	\$11	56%
Phoenix	San Carlos	11,830	37%	\$6,523,921	\$602,000	\$51	39%
Phoenix	Elko	2,193	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	63%
Phoenix	Duckwater	183	150%	\$0	\$0	\$0	150%
Phoenix	Ely	370	76%	\$0	\$0	\$0	76%
Phoenix	Gila River	19,771	44%	\$7,238,771	\$668,000	\$34	45%
Phoenix	PITU	426	138%	\$0	\$0	\$0	138%
Phoenix	Owyhee	1,553	127%	\$0	\$0	\$0	127%
Phoenix	Schurz/Walker River	1,043	72%	\$0	\$0	\$0	72%
Phoenix	Fallon/Lovelock/Yomba	1,816	52%	\$421,779	\$39,000	\$21	53%
Phoenix	Pyramid Lake	1,723	42%	\$902,577	\$83,000	\$48	44%
Phoenix	Reno-Sparks/Nevada Urban	3,359	44%	\$1,462,960	\$135,000	\$40	46%
Phoenix	Las Vegas/Moapa	1,152	46%	\$485,074	\$45,000	\$39	48%
Phoenix	Ft. Mcdermitt	848	52%	\$209,544	\$19,000	\$22	53%
Phoenix	Washoe	2,258	48%	\$783,846	\$72,000	\$32	49%
Phoenix	Yerington	655	55%	\$111,007	\$10,000	\$15	55%
Phoenix Total		136,431	51%	\$36,334,947	\$3,359,000	\$25	52%
Portland	Burns Paiute	230	127%	\$0	\$0	\$0	127%

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution
FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
Portland	Chehalis	856	46%	\$364,073	\$34,000	\$40	47%
Portland	Coeur D'Alene	3,173	51%	\$748,313	\$69,000	\$22	52%
Portland	Colville	7,531	52%	\$1,430,143	\$132,000	\$18	53%
Portland	Coos, L Umpqua, Suislaw	482	91%	\$0	\$0	\$0	91%
Portland	Coquille	633	79%	\$0	\$0	\$0	79%
Portland	Cow Creek	905	58%	\$57,744	\$10,000	\$11	58%
Portland	Grand Ronde	3,465	57%	\$291,845	\$27,000	\$8	57%
Portland	Hoh	77	60%	\$0	\$0	\$0	60%
Portland	Jamestown S'Klallam	336	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	66%
Portland	Kalispel	437	35%	\$307,284	\$28,000	\$64	38%
Portland	Klamath	2,478	59%	\$74,672	\$10,000	\$4	59%
Portland	Kootenai	166	86%	\$0	\$0	\$0	86%
Portland	Lower Elwha	851	53%	\$164,568	\$15,000	\$18	54%
Portland	Lummi	4,569	48%	\$1,335,791	\$123,000	\$27	49%
Portland	Makah	1,902	50%	\$509,789	\$47,000	\$25	51%
Portland	Muckleshoot	2,934	29%	\$2,407,577	\$222,000	\$76	32%
Portland	Nez Perce	3,727	64%	\$0	\$0	\$0	64%
Portland	Nisqually	910	59%	\$26,975	\$10,000	\$11	59%
Portland	Nooksack	976	43%	\$502,140	\$46,000	\$47	44%
Portland	Nw Band Of Shoshoni	205	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	61%
Portland	Port Gamble	919	52%	\$220,163	\$20,000	\$22	53%
Portland	Puyallup	7,469	58%	\$261,596	\$24,000	\$3	59%
Portland	Quileute	556	52%	\$123,844	\$11,000	\$20	53%
Portland	Quinalt	2,558	66%	\$0	\$0	\$0	66%
Portland	Samish	144	122%	\$0	\$0	\$0	122%
Portland	Sauk-Suiattle	138	133%	\$0	\$0	\$0	133%
Portland	Shoalwater Bay	308	136%	\$0	\$0	\$0	136%
Portland	Shoshone-Bannock	5,883	61%	\$0	\$0	\$0	61%
Portland	Siletz	4,727	47%	\$1,398,629	\$129,000	\$27	49%
Portland	Skokomish	931	57%	\$75,354	\$10,000	\$11	58%
Portland	Spokane	2,676	52%	\$540,410	\$50,000	\$19	53%
Portland	Snoqualmie	501	8%	\$772,458	\$329,000	\$657	30%
Portland	Squaxin Island	746	67%	\$0	\$0	\$0	67%
Portland	Stillaguamish	177	86%	\$0	\$0	\$0	86%
Portland	Suquamish	494	79%	\$0	\$0	\$0	79%

FY 2000 FDI: Table 8 -- IHCIF Distribution
FY 2001 Distribution of the \$40 Million IHCIF

Area	Local Operating Unit	Users	FEHBP %	To get to 60%	IHCIF Allocation	IHCIF / User	Revised %
Portland	Swinomish	1,079	51%	\$280,885	\$26,000	\$24	52%
Portland	Tulalip	3,472	36%	\$2,118,301	\$196,000	\$56	39%
Portland	Umatilla	2,885	63%	\$0	\$0	\$0	63%
Portland	Upper Skagit	420	52%	\$87,335	\$10,000	\$24	53%
Portland	Warm Springs	4,695	85%	\$0	\$0	\$0	85%
Portland	Yakama	11,988	51%	\$2,539,469	\$234,000	\$20	51%
Portland	Western Oregon (Chemawa)	2,844	40%	\$1,518,806	\$140,000	\$49	42%
Portland Total		92,451	55%	\$18,158,165	\$1,952,000	\$21	56%
Tucson	Tonono O'Odham	18,778	51%	\$3,572,891	\$330,000	\$18	52%
Tucson	Yaqui	4,833	67%	\$0	\$0	\$0	67%
Tucson Total		23,611	50%	\$3,572,891	\$330,000	\$14	51%
Grand Total		1,428,118	50%	\$426,273,940	\$40,000,000	\$28	51%

These results include the following revisions to the methodology since the 2/14/2001 draft was released:

- 1) Discounted facility value (depreciation) by the cost to correct facility deficiencies;
- 2) Excluded patient transport costs (\$34m in lower 48 and \$32m in Alaska);
- 3) Excluded 12.5% of shares in all operating units consistent with CSC exclusions;
- 4) 4 OUs in Navajo, 2 in Phoenix, and 1 in Albuquerque Areas were broken out from previously consolidated service units;
- 5) Included "crossover" funding adjustments between Albuquerque, Navajo, Phoenix and Tucson Areas (debits and credits net to zero);
- 6) Included additional Non-CHSDA users which are proportionately identified by operating unit;
- 7) Revised data for a some OUs including purchase percentage and cost index based on an average of counties served;
- 8) Corrected FY 2000 financial data for some operating units including some documented exclusions;
- 9) Adjusted allocations to assure a minimum of \$10,000 for any qualifying operating unit below 60%;
- 10) Rounded draft allocations to the nearest \$1,000.
- 11) Adjusted allocations to insure a 30% minimum.
- 12) Reinstated a poverty index weighted at 1/3 and the health status index at 2/3.
- 13) Discounted the flat estimate of other resources by half for OUs that do not delivery billable services.
- 14) Changed named from LNF to FEI (FEHBP Equivalence Index) to accurately describe the methodology and reduce misunderstanding.